



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/803,825	03/12/2001	Andrew D. Dingsor	RSW920000169US1	1006

7590 04/16/2007
Esther H. Chong, Esquire
Synnestvedt & Lechner LLP
2600 Aramark Tower
1101 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19107-2950

EXAMINER

SWEARINGEN, JEFFREY R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2145

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
2 MONTHS	04/16/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 09/803,825
Filing Date: March 12, 2001
Appellant(s): DINGSOR ET AL.

MAILED

APR 16 2007

Technology Center 2100

John R. Brancolinii
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 3/30/2007 appealing from the Office action mailed 9/15/2006.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

Art Unit: 2145

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

6,353,614

Borella et al.

3-2002

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Borella et al. (US 6,353,614 B1).

In regard to claims 1, 9 and 15, Borella disclosed:

preparing, by said one of the plurality of servers, a response packet responsive to the client packet; (column 9, lines 1-16)

performing, by said one of the plurality of servers, a translation operation on the response packet to produce a translated response packet; (column 9, lines 1-16) and

transmitting the translated response packet directly to the client from said one of the plurality of servers, thereby bypassing the NAT machine. (column 12, lines 16-27)

Art Unit: 2145

Claim 9 further disclosed:

a NAT machine for receiving a client packet from a client, performing an inbound translation on the client packet to produce a translated client packet, and sending said translated packet to one of a plurality of servers coupled to the NAT machine. (column 4, lines 25-37)

In regard to claim 2, Borella disclosed:

determining whether translation instructions are stored in said one of the servers; (column 12, lines 16-27)

executing the performing step if the determining step indicates that the translation instructions are stored in said one of the servers. (column 12, lines 16-27)

In regard to claims 3, 10 and 16, Borella disclosed:

sending the response packet from said one of the servers to the NAT machine if the determining step indicates that the translation instructions are not stored in said one of the servers. (column 12, lines 3-27)

In regard to claims 4, 11 and 17, Borella disclosed:

performing a translation operation on all subsequent response packets prepared by said one of the servers based on the translation instructions; (column 12, lines 16-27) and

transmitting the translated subsequent response packets directly to the client. (column 12, lines 16-27)

In regard to claims 5 and 18, Borella disclosed:

determining, by the NAT machine, if predetermined criteria have been satisfied for sending the translation instructions to said one of the servers; (column 8, lines 28-61) and

Art Unit: 2145

sending the translation instructions to said one of the servers if the predetermined criteria have been satisfied. (column 8, lines 28-61)

In regard to claims 6, 12 and 19, Borella disclosed:

the translations instructions identify information to be modified in a header of the response packet. (column 8, lines 28-61)

In regard to claims 7, 13 and 20, Borella disclosed:

evaluating a header of the response packet to identify a current IP destination address and a current destination port indicated in the header, (column 9, lines 1-16)

determining, using the translation instructions, a client IP address and a client port associated with the current IP destination address and the current destination port, (column 9, lines 1-16) and

modifying the header of the response packet to designate the client IP address and client port as the current IP destination address and the current destination port, respectively. (column 9, lines 1-16)

In regard to claims 8, 14 and 21, Borella disclosed:

transmitting, by the NAT machine, instructions to stop the translation operation; (column 7, lines 25-44) and

transmitting, by said one of the servers, the response packet to the NAT machine according to said instructions. (column 7, lines 25-44)

(10) Response to Argument

Appellant argued that Borella failed to teach *transmitting the translated response packet directly to the client from said one of the plurality of servers, thereby bypassing the NAT machine*. Appellant only cited a limited portion of the portion of Borella previously cited in the rejection.

Referring to column 12, lines 16-27 of Borella:

Art Unit: 2145

Router **26** also routes data packets from the second external computer network back to a network device on the first computer network using the globally unique port in the combination network address. Router **26** is no longer required to replace an internal network address with an external network address for outbound traffic, and replace an external network address with an internal network address for inbound traffic. Thus, DNAT of the present invention removes the computational burden of NAT from router **26** and does not violate the Internet principal of providing end-to-end transmission of data packets between network devices without alternations.

Borella explicitly teaches here that the router or NAT machine is no longer required to perform NAT functions on the packet on the return trip. The use of the "globally unique port" is the use of a pre-specified number for software routing.

Appellant has confused the router with the NAT machine. The NAT machine is the interior portion of the router in Borella which performs the NAT functionality. Appellant never claimed the NAT machine was a separate physical entity from the router. It is well known in computing that separate modules or processing cards are present in an individual computer, server, or router, to handle separate tasks. In this case, Borella used a NAT function on the outbound side, but not on the inbound side.


Borella ide. Borella *bypassed* the NAT machine.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,


Jeffrey R. Swearingen

Conferees:

Jason Cardone

Rupal Dharia


JASON CARDONE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER


RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER